UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,263	07/08/2003	Patrice Savini	TI-35374	8130

23494 7590 10/20/2006

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER	
SHAN, APRIL YING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,263	SAVINI, PATRICE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April Y. Shan	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/12/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 have been examined.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers filed under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d) based on an application filed in European Patent Office on 02 May 2003. Applicant has not complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.63(c), since the oath, declaration or application data sheet does not acknowledge the filing of any foreign application. A new oath, declaration or application data sheet is required in the body of which the present application should be identified by application number and filing date.

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in European Patent Office on 02 May 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the EPO 03291079.6 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. In claims 1, 7-8 and 14, "accessing data...in a very secure way" should be "accessing data...in a secure way";

b. Claim 2 is being objected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 1 upon which it depends. Further, "a common resource" should be "the common resource segment";

c. In claims 1, 3 and 10, "a highly secure" should be "a secure";

d. Claim 9 is being objected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 8 upon which it depends. Further, "a common resource" should be "the common resource segment";

e. Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being objected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Check the claims and correct any informality the Applicant is aware of. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "the engagement boxes" recited in lines 8-9 lacks of an antecedent basis. Additionally, "the person" recited in lines 7-8 lacks of an antecedent basis. Further, "the same box" recited in 11, which box the Applicant refers to? An engagement box or firewall box? Furthermore, "LDAP" recited in line 13, which LDAP the Applicant refers to? The first LDAP or the second LDAP?

Claim 2 is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 1 upon which it depends. Additionally, "the remote display" recited in line 17 lacks of an antecedent basis.

In claim 3, "the remote display" recited in line 7 on page 12 lacks of an antecedent basis.

Claim 7 is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 3 upon which it depends. Additionally, "the user/password of the person" recited in line 2 on page 13 lacks of an antecedent basis. Further, "the engagement boxes" recited in lines 3-4 on page 13 lacks of an antecedent basis. Furthermore, "the same box" recited in line 6 on page 13, which box the Applicant refers to? An engagement box or firewall box? Finally, "LDAP" recited in line 14, which LDAP the Applicant refers to? The first LDAP or the second LDAP?

In claim 8, "the engagement boxes" recited in line 17 on page 13 lacks of an antecedent basis. Furthermore, "the person" recited in line 17 lacks of an antecedent basis. Also, "the same box" recited in 20, which box the Applicant refers to? An engagement box or firewall box? Finally, "LDAP" recited in line 22, which LDAP the Applicant refers to? The first LDAP or the second LDAP?

Claim 9 is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 8 upon which it depends. Additionally, "the remote display" recited in line 3 lacks of an antecedent basis.

In claim 10, "the remote display" recited in line 13 lacks of an antecedent basis.

Claim14 is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 10 upon which it depends. Additionally, "the user/password of the person" recited in line 5 on

page 15 lacks of an antecedent basis. Further, "the engagement boxes" recited in line 7 on page 15 lacks of an antecedent basis. Furthermore, "the same box" recited in line 9 on page 15, which box the Applicant refers to? An engagement box or firewall box? Finally, "LDAP" recited in line 11, which LDAP the Applicant refers to? The first LDAP or the second LDAP?

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1, 3-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing secure access. The examiner respectfully asserts that the claimed subject matter does not fall within the statutory classes listed in 35 USC 101. The claimed steps do not result in a tangible result. Claim 1 is rejected as being directed to an abstract idea (i.e., producing non-tangible result) [tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a 101 judicial exception, in that the process must set forth a practical application of that 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result, Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77).

Claims 3-7 are directed a method of enabling a collaborative network. The examiner respectfully asserts that the claimed subject matter does not fall within

the statutory classes listed in 35 USC 101. The claimed steps do not result in a tangible result. Claims 3-7 are rejected as being directed to an abstract idea (i.e., producing non-tangible result) [tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a 101 judicial exception, in that the process must set forth a practical application of that 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result, Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77).

Claims 10-13 are directed to a system for enabling collaboration. However, it appears that the system is software, per se to an ordinary person in the art, because "a highly secure common resource computing zone" is a software interface in paragraph [0006] on page 2 in the specification. Also, "means for providing security" is LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) is software in paragraph [0018] on page in the specification. There is no element positively recited as part of the apparatus. Applicant's specification provides no explicit and deliberate definition on any element positively recited as part of the system, and it appears that such would reasonably be interpreted as representative of the software which can enable collaboration. As such, it believed that the system of claims 10-13 is reasonably interpreted as functional descriptive material, per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 3-6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Araujo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502).

As **per claims 3 and 10**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system enbling a collaborative network with partners (partner is "technical personnel as well as an authorized third-party user, i.e., resellers, system integrators and installers" – e.g. col. 16, lines 1-5) without compromising Intellectual Property comprising: providing a highly secure common resource computing zone with services such as design and production wherein data input and output remains on the secure common resource computing zone (col. 7, lines 7-27); and providing layers of security to separate engagement boxes for each of the partners in said secure common resource computing zone where the partners can work simultaneously, run simulation tests, emulate software problems and share in said secure common resource computing zone with just the remote display going back to the engagement box of the partner and therefore to the partner outside the owner ("the SEP can readily support simultaneous access by multiple remotely located clients" –e.g. col. 12, lines 59-61, col. 12, lines 63-67 and col. 13, lines 60-67 – col. 14, lines 1-14).

As per **claims 4-5 and claims 11-12**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system as applied in claims 3 and 10. Araujo et al. further discloses including said partners running local applications on said engagement boxes such as design applications, mail, editor, etc. or on a server farm segment that resides on the secure common resource computing zone for bigger batch or interactive jobs (e.g. col. 8, lines 12-23, col. 7, lines 44-47, fig. 7, col. 10, lines 54-58, fig. 10, col. 10, lines 66 – col. 11, lines 1-9) and including providing a backend segment that includes an intranet access through a firewall to an owner's intranet (col. 11, lines 10-11, col. 15, lines 60- col. 16, line 42 and fig. 14. Please note Interface with back-end business system with accounting, billing, etc. application is on owner's intranet).

As per **claims 6 and 13**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system as applied in claims 5 and 12. Araujo et al. further discloses including providing an access box for management of all critical boxes in said secure computing zone (e.g. software 1900 in fig. 19 and col. 11, lines 33-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. Claims 1-2, 7-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502).

As per **claims 1 and 8**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system for providing highly secure access of a partner to the development environment of another partner (partner is "technical personnel as well as an authorized third-party user, i.e., resellers, system integrators and installers" –e.g. col. 16, lines 1-5) comprising:

starting a VPN tunnel ("a VPN connection" – e.g. col. 7, line 28) between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel ("encrypted communication provided through conventional secure sockets layer (SSL)" – e.g. col. 13, lines 24-26 and SSL 17 in fig. 1) end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password ("the user then enter his(her) username and password" – e.g. col. 14, lines 54-56 and "lists of user names and passwords" – e.g. col. 22, lines 53-57);

starting a session by the partner in a Web page (WAN 30 (internet) and Web Site 20 in fig. 1, "shown in Fig. 1, to start a client application session – e.g. col. 10, lines 62-65 and "a session begins through which a web page is downloaded by SEP 2000, as shown in Fig. 1 – e.g. col. 14, lines 49-65) on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP the user/password of the person ("protocol engine could access a non-local database through a conventional protocol, such as LDAP" – e.g. col. 33, lines 34-38);

routing the session to an engagement box (service enablement platform (SEP 200) in fig. 1) depending on the person where the engagement boxes are ("Ethernet ports 1 and 2 permit the SEP to be situated in series.." – e.g. col. 16, lines 66-67 to col. 17, lines 1-9) on network segments separated by firewall boxes (firewall/router 57 in fig. 1, col. 13, lines 43-47 and col. 13, lines 50-53) wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same box (col. 15, lines 66 – col. 16, line 14); and

accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated LDAP ("protocol engine could access a non-local database through a conventional protocol, such as LDAP" – e.g. col. 33, lines 34-38) to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a very secure way (e.g. abstract and col. 8, lines 12-23).

Araujo et al. teaches the use of logon/password and LDAP as discussed above. Araujo et al. does not specifically disclose using another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP. However, it would have obvious for a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add using another logon/password validating thru second LDAP to the method taught by Araujo et al. motivated by providing a technique that "secures, but integrated network functionality through a remote WAN connection between a remote client PC and a server based on an office LAN" (Araujo et al. col. 7, lines 7-20)

As per **claims 2 and 9**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system as applied in claims 1 and 8. Araujo et al. further discloses submitting batch or interactive jobs to a server farm on a common resource segment so data input and data output on the server farm remains on a common resource but the remote display is going back to the engagement box of the partner (e.g. col. 8, lines 12-23, col. 7, lines 44-47, fig. 7, col. 10, lines 54-58, fig. 10, col. 10, lines 66 – col. 11, lines 1-9).

As per **claims 7 and 14**, Araujo et al. discloses a method/system as applied in **claims 3 and 10**. Araujo et al. further discloses providing a VPN tunnel ("a VPN connection" – e.g. col. 7, line 28) between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel ("encrypted communication provided through conventional secure sockets layer (SSL)" – e.g. col. 13, lines 24-26 and SSL 17 in fig. 1) end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password ("the user then enter his(her) username and password" – e.g.

col. 14, lines 54-56 and "lists of user names and passwords" – e.g. col. 22, lines 53-57);

starting a session by the partner in a Web page (WAN 30 (internet) and Web Site 20 in fig. 1, "shown in Fig. 1, to start a client application session – e.g. col. 10, lines 62-65 and "a session begins through which a web page is downloaded by SEP 2000, as shown in Fig. 1 – e.g. col. 14, lines 49-65) on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP the user/password of the person ("protocol engine could access a non-local database through a conventional protocol, such as LDAP" – e.g. col. 33, lines 34-38);

routing the session to an engagement box (service enablement platform (SEP 200) in fig. 1) depending on the person where the engagement boxes are ("Ethernet ports 1 and 2 permit the SEP to be situated in series.." – e.g. col. 16, lines 66-67 to col. 17, lines 1-9) on network segments separated by firewall boxes (firewall/router 57 in fig. 1, col. 13, lines 43-47 and col. 13, lines 50-53) and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same box (col. 15, lines 66 – col. 16, line 14); and accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated LDAP ("protocol engine could access a non-local database through a conventional protocol, such as LDAP" – e.g. col. 33, lines 34-38) to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a very secure way (e.g. abstract col. 8, lines 12-23).

Araujo et al. teaches the use of logon/password and LDAP as discussed above. Araujo et al. is silent on using another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP. However, it would have obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add using another logon/password validating thru second LDAP to the method taught by Araujo et al. motivated by providing a technique that "secures, but integrated network functionality through a remote WAN connection between a remote client PC and a server based on an office LAN" (Araujo et al. col. 7, lines 7-20)

Double Patenting

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/615,103 (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0221179). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-8 and 10-14 encompass the same subject matter as claims 1-10 in the copending application.

Claims 1-7 recite a method for providing highly secure access of a partner to the development environment of another partner comprising the steps of: starting a VPN tunnel between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password; starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP the user/password of the person; routing the session to an engagement box depending on the person where the engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same box; and accessing

data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a very secure way The method of claim 5 including the step of providing an access box for management of all critical boxes in said secure computing zone. The method of claim 3 wherein said providing layers of security step includes the steps of: starting a VPN tunnel between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password; starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP the user/password of the person; routing the session to an engagement box depending on the person where the engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same box; and accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a very secure way. (Claims 1-3 and 5 of copending application publication).

Claim 8 recites In a design zone system with means for starting (The terms "starting a VPN tunnel" and "providing a VPN tunnel" are interpreted as having the same meaning a VPN tunnel between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password; means for starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates thru LDAP the user/password of the person; means for routing the

session to an engagement box depending on the person where the engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same box; and means for accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a very secure way (Claim 1 of copending application publication)

Claim 10 recites In a system of enabling collaboration by owners of a collaborative network with partners such as sub-contractors, customers and/or Electronic Design Automation (EDA) vendors without compromising Intellectual Property by providing by the owner a highly secure common resource computing environment or design zone with services on the common resource or design zone being protected by multiple layers of security to engagement boxes of the partners where the partners can work simultaneously, run simulation tests, emulate software problems and share in a secure zone with just the remote display going back to the engagement box of the partner and therefore to the partner outside the owner (Claim 2 of copending application publication)

Claims 11-14 recite a system for enabling collaboration by an owner of a collaborative network with partners such as sub-contractors, customers and/or Electronic Design Automation (EDA) vendors without compromising Intellectual Property comprising: a highly secure common resource computing zone with services

wherein data input and output remains on the secure common resource computing zone; and means for providing security to separate engagement boxes for each partner in said secure common resource computing zone where the partners can work simultaneously, run simulation tests, emulate software problems or share in said secure common resource computing zone with just the remote display is going back to the engagement box of the partner and therefore to the partner outside the owner. The system of claim 10 wherein said partners can run local applications on said engagement boxes such as design applications, mail, editor, etc or on a server farm segment that resides on the common resources zone for bigger batch or interactive jobs. The system of claim 10 including a backend segment that includes an owner's intranet access through a firewall to an owner's intranet. (Claims 4 and 6-10 of copending application publication)

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Araujo et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0032725) discloses an apparatus and method for use therein for implementing an integrated, virtual office user environment.

- Short (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,526) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing dynamic tunnel access sessions at a network device within a communication network.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April Y. Shan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AYS

12 October 2006
AYS

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100